

HUMAN EVENTS

Volume XIII, No. 12

Saturday, March 24, 1956

Washington, D. C.

News Section

Printed in Two Sections

Profile of a Demagogue: The sacred band of Democratic demagogues in the U.S. Senate now, somewhat unhappily, welcomes the political hero of the week to its ranks. Kefauver belongs with Humphrey, Lehman, Morse and Neuberger. His demagogic capers on the hustings have now become famous. In Miami, he energetically sought the Zionist vote, out-promising all opposition in bidding the U.S. Government send arms to Israel. When he got to California, he left Negro leaders with the impression that he might use Federal bayonets to enforce integration. Back in Dixie, in Florida, he managed to hedge on that promise. And in crucial Minnesota, he did not stop at bellying for 90 per cent farm price supports — he insisted on 100 per cent. Finally, all over the lot, he pledged labor leaders anything they want.

His colleagues in the upper chamber — whether demagogues or not — have never demonstrated any warm respect and friendship for him. It is noticeable that, until now, no Democratic Senator has come out for him. One reason for this is that the Tennessee Senator — in the opinion of other Senators — ranks as perhaps the most unintelligent man in the legislative body. (This fact is also well recognized throughout the press corps in the Capital.) Another reason for his unpopularity among Senators is that Estes fails to pull his oar in the immense mass of committee work which is always necessary in the behind-the-scenes study and passage of legislation. In the cloakrooms, they will tell you — somewhat caustically — that Kefauver's rate of absence from the Capital is just about the highest in the legislature. However, once they deploy the TV camera apparatus, Estes materializes almost instantly. A fair estimate by newsies is as follows: his time and energy are devoted exclusively to (1) protecting his vote back home, and (2) running for the presidency.

One thing the past week's Kefauver success has taught observers here: don't trust the pollsters. Rarely has this tribe been so wrong. The last

Minnesota poll, conducted by the Minneapolis *Star-Tribune* (Cowles-owned), showed Stevenson getting 57 per cent and Kefauver 43 per cent of the voters who had at that time made up their minds. The ballots cast last Tuesday registered almost a reverse of these figures. Also, all the Gallup nationwide polls indicated that Adlai would enjoy an overwhelming majority over Estes — so overwhelming, indeed, that the Tennessee Senator had (it is known) great difficulty in getting campaign funds. Consequently, the national columnists (who devoted much of their copy to this race) took it for granted that Stevenson would prove a shoo-in for the nomination. This view, in turn, had a big effect on local scribes and commentators, and the result was a staggering surprise — a result of the initial error on the part of the ineffable pollsters.

Reveille in Dixie: HUMAN EVENTS correspondents south of the Chickahominy (the same that gave us our scoop, last November, on "interposition") this week relay to us what goes on behind the Confederate campfires:

"White people down here now feel a sense of security and confidence which they lacked a year ago. Then they were scared and craved leadership and organization in grappling with the new and fearsome thing, 'desegregation.' (This was at a time when no northern papers reported any discontent with desegregation.)

"Now, today, when the northern papers (*vide* the *New York Times*) are frantic with the discovery that there exists a veritable war against the Supreme Court decree, the Southerners are actually calmer, because they feel — what with leadership and organization — they are getting somewhere.

"Their spirit spurred the 100 members of Congress to serve public notice that they would legally oppose the Court decision. In Washington, it was

obviously not realized that this manifesto was a necessity because of the 'home folks' — fires had been lit under almost every southern member of Congress, even under the widely respected Senator Harry Byrd. Potential recruits for congressional seats were appearing and the incumbents had to produce something for home consumption. Yet few northern papers showed any awareness of this.

"Nor was it reported north of the Mason-Dixon line that presidential candidate Estes Kefauver — despite his northern victories — scored no success in Dixie. On the contrary — when the Tennessean refused to sign the manifesto to Congress, he killed his chances of support in the South — few down here will dissent to that.

"Much talk here of a Third Party, but no discernible work on organization to that end. Those who recreated interposition would like to see some Northern and Western States and politicians thereof in such a Third Party. They shrink from any purely sectional party. They feel that southern defiance of Washington decrees should draw some approving responses from somewhere on the western prairies.

"Therefore, in that intellectual capital of 'interposition,' Richmond, Virginia, there are some remarks that the South could do worse than follow a Third Party banner waved by some damyankee such as Governor J. Bracken Lee of Utah, whose war with the Federal Income Tax and Treasury has won fame. (Anyway, any candidate named Lee could hardly fail to win support in the state of Virginia.)"

Income Tax: There are signs that the forces arrayed to repeal or drastically revise the income tax are on the march again with renewed vigor. There is, for instance, the case of Mr. T. Coleman Andrews, Commissioner of Internal Revenue from 1953 to 1955, who resigned several months ago to return to private life. Most commissioners, when they relinquish their posts, leave the subject alone, whatever they may personally feel about the income tax. But Mr. Andrews is publicly and privately critical of the whole business. In January on a radio program, he said harsh things about the income tax, remarking that it "was conceived in vengeance, rather than as a revenue measure,

that it is considered to be an instrument of penalizing success and that today rates are so high that they are confiscatory."

But the ex-Commissioner looks neither to total abolition and repeal nor to any particular scheme to solve the problem. He wants Congress to establish an independent bipartisan commission to study the revision of the national tax structure. The income tax law has been on the books for 42 years and it's high time to review its record.

Watch for an article by Mr. Andrews on the tax question, scheduled to appear in Hearst's *American Weekly*, April 22.

Meanwhile, the Organization to Repeal Federal Income Taxes, Inc., goes ahead. Its president, Corinne Griffith, is filling speaking dates at meetings on the east coast now. And Governor J. Bracken Lee is sticking to his position in his conflict with the U.S. Treasury. Several months ago he refused to pay Federal taxes on his personal income on the ground that the Federal government has no constitutional power to spend his money to support or aid foreign nations. Lee wants to make a test case in the civil courts and is prepared to pay the penalty of 6 per cent interest if he loses the case as finally judged. He chose this method to dramatize and bring home to the average taxpayer the problem of the Federal income tax.

It is now reported that some high luminaries in the American Bar Association are interested in the case and have offered to defend Lee in court, in a legal process which may make history.

Not Merely Gossip: The President's request for huge (\$5 billion) foreign (military and economic) aid transcends all previous executive demands of this kind, and is getting some challenges from members of Congress. Before the House Foreign Relations Committee, early this week, Representative Thomas J. Dodd (D., Conn.) raised the question of the constitutionality of long-term commitments to pay foreign aid. He pointed to Article I, Section 8, No. 12 of the Constitution which says that Congress shall have power "to raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two

years.” Representative E. Ross Adair (R., Ind.) chimed in and wanted to know by what constitutional authority could one Congress bind succeeding Congresses to pay out funds for foreign aid.

● The new version of the Bricker amendment, voted on favorably by the Judiciary Committee by a large majority, has run into an unexpected obstacle. The small minority (two members) who voted against want to file a minority report. But that takes time and the dissenters found the State Department willing to oblige in writing up the dissent for them. (An extraordinary proceeding, indeed, for a branch of the Executive to compose a legislative report for a committee of the Legislature!) But the State Department — or rather Assistant Secretary Herman Phleger’s Legal Division — is infernally busy, and so has not had time to finish the job. It’s that Division, reportedly controlled by several Acheson holdovers, which has been the kernel of opposition to the Bricker amendment right along.

● It is incorrectly asserted this week on Capitol Hill that the late Senator Taft would have opposed the present compromise measure — hotly debated as we go to press — of electoral college reform. True, Taft did oppose the Lodge-Gossett proposal for such reform in 1950. But, later — influenced (we happen to know) by the HUMAN EVENTS campaign for electoral reform — Taft in 1953 privately took a favorable view of the Mundt-Coudert proposal which today is in part incorporated in the measure now before the Senate. With his genius for compromise, it is felt, Taft would have supported the present proposed amendment which is an amalgam of the two alternatives of electoral reform (Lodge-Gossett and Mundt-Coudert) in one package.

Labor Front: Secretary of Labor James Paul Mitchell, in the consensus of Capitol Hill, somehow never knows when to leave well enough alone. Now he has found his way into the doghouse of GOP labor legislation experts by again teeing off on Rep. Graham Barden, veteran and widely-respected North Carolina Democrat, the chairman of the House Labor Committee.

Addressing a luncheon gathering of some 30 members of the Legislative Committee of the

United Steel Workers, Mitchell described Barden as a roadblock who “doesn’t see fit to call a hearing” on what he described as pro-labor legislation proposed by the Administration. (What he meant, of course, was pro-union; he insists on using the words “labor” and “union” interchangeably, as was pointed out in the Jan. 6 HUMAN EVENTS feature article, “Politically, Unions Aren’t Labor.”)

If Mitchell would check with GOP members of Barden’s Committee, he would find them quite content with his stewardship. Most of them have no stomach for Mitchell’s “liberal” legislative proposals; no Administration pressure is being applied in their behalf, either, so GOP committeemen are happy to let them lie doggo, with Barden getting credit or blame, depending on the point of view. They just wish Mitchell would stop needling him, lest Barden become fed up and loose the flood gates.

Letter from Js GRAY, Former President, Inland Daily Press Association: “HUMAN EVENTS is a valuable aid to anyone interested in the significance of current news. Its scope is broad, its selections timely, its form convenient.”

The New (Red) Party Line: Amid the welter of speculation as to the real reasons why the Kremlin decided to portray its late Premier Josef Stalin as the sadist he was rather than the saint he had been pictured to be, one of the most amusing sidelights is to be found in the gyrating contortions of the *Daily Worker*, organ of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

With publication of stories telling of the Krushchev speech denouncing Stalin before a closed meeting of Congress leaders and of the befuddled, bewildered reaction to the “new look” at Stalin, there came a *Daily Worker* column, by Managing Editor Alan Max, saying among other things: “Any Marxist who says he has not been jolted is either not being honest with himself, in my opinion, or minimizes the extent of the developments now in progress in the Soviet Union.”

Next was a lengthy, verbose dissertation by William Z. Foster, national chairman of the Com-

munist Party, U.S.A. Loaded with typical Red dogma and doctrine doubletalk, the gist of his diatribe seemed to be that the present party leadership realized the benefits of multi-manned collective leadership as contrasted to Stalin's one-man dictatorship. It accused Stalin of having taken the "lion's share" of credit for the work of others, and of having "minimized or covered up" his mistakes.

Finally came a long editorial, obviously laying down the new Party line. The thesis was something brand new for Communists: Foster speaks for himself; Max speaks for himself; "the *Daily Worker* speaks for itself;" everybody should speak his own mind. It jeered at stories in other newspapers as being based on the incorrect premise that "no differences of opinion are permitted [among Communists] to exist or to be expressed." Anyone who has kept watch on the *Daily Worker* and the Communist movement in the past, knows full well that if any differences of opinion did exist, they were not allowed to be expressed.

"We will encourage our readers and writers," says the *Daily Worker*, "to say exactly what is on their minds."

Most assuredly, something new has been added. So, too, has something else, judging by the *Daily Worker's* inference that henceforth the American party will, to a much greater extent, make its own policy decisions. This, experts on Communism agree, must be seen to be believed.

Byrd Budget: Sen. Harry F. Byrd, the veteran Virginia Democrat whose philosophy of government is more soundly conservative than those of many legislators masquerading under the Republican label, annually prepares and submits to the public his own version of a Federal budget. Little if any notice is given to it by newspapers; it deserves much greater attention.

Just released is the "Byrd Budget" for the fiscal year 1957, starting next July 1. It proposes that Congress appropriate \$58.5 billion for the coming year, which would be a cut of \$7.8 billion

below the amount requested by President Eisenhower, and that it cut \$3.2 billion from the \$65.9 billion of expenditures authorizations asked by Mr. Eisenhower. The "Byrd Budget" is estimated to yield a governmental surplus of \$3.6 billion for the fiscal year.

The cuts, says the Senator, would be made generally in "non-essential domestic-civilian programs," in "armed services waste and extravagance, new foreign economic assistance," and "non-essential build-up in unexpended balances," i.e., appropriation of monies to be spent in future years.

Byrd notes that the Federal budget "will be in delicate temporary balance," with an estimated surplus of \$230 million, when the current fiscal year ends June 30. But, he adds, this will be "by inadvertance. . . . The spenders underestimated receipts."

He adds: "In 26 years, since we started the deficit financing spree, interest on the steadily growing debt has cost taxpaying Americans \$82 billion. Interest in the coming year will bring the cost of this debt to nearly \$90 billion."

25,535: The circulation of HUMAN EVENTS was 5,000 in 1952. It is now 25,535. For purposes of comparison, the last published circulation figures (September 30, 1955) for the *New Republic* was 27,339 and for the *Nation*, 30,459. HUMAN EVENTS expects to pass these circulation totals (of opposing "liberal" publications) by mid-summer.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 6 weeks for \$1.

Yearly rate, \$10; 6 months, \$6; 3 months, \$3.

By first class mail, \$12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) \$14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, \$13 a year; airmail, \$18.

Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

1955 Bound Annual Volume with complete Index \$15.

All Bound Volumes for years prior to 1955 have been sold.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, Editor and Publisher

Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

JAMES L. WICK, Executive Publisher

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1956.

Article Section

THE MIDDLE OF THE ROAD WHERE IT LEADS

By RICHARD M. WEAVER

WHEN YOU drive your car, do you drive in the middle of the road? This seems a silly question to ask because you don't, of course, if you want to stay alive and get somewhere.

But a lot of people have been sold on the idea that the middle of the road is the safest place in politics and on all sorts of controversial questions. They have been led to believe that in the middle position you are out of harm's way and you are more likely to be right than those who are on either side of a question. A little thought will show that this idea is borne not of wisdom but of confusion or fear or both.

Properly speaking, middle-of-the-roadism is not a political philosophy at all. It is rather the absence of a philosophy or an attempt to evade having a philosophy. All great movements in the past have grown out of and have depended upon some self-consistent view of man and society. They have presented a program embodying clear principles, and people have gotten behind the movements because they wanted the principles to triumph. In no case did they labor and fight to see the principles bartered away for a few concessions by the opposition. If they felt they were right, they were not willing to settle by splitting the difference between themselves and the enemy. The great sacrifices of history have not been inspired by political trimming and unmanly compromise. Try imagining the figure that

Washington would cut in history today if he had decided on a compromise settlement with the British.

Middle-of-the-road policies have a false attraction for some people because they keep them from having to think a position through. All they have to do is borrow a little from the parties on either side of them, add this up, and tell themselves that this is the "sound" position. But a position half way between right and wrong is not a sound position. It only postpones and makes more difficult the eventual decision. And there are different views of man's destiny which can never be made compatible.

Middle-of-the-roadism is seldom anything more than short-sightedness. It is not an insight into political matters because it is wholly dependent upon what other parties say, or stand for. It takes its bearing from them. And far from being safe, it is just the spot to catch brickbats from both sides.

WHEN YOU ask people why they have adopted a middle-of-the-road position, you nearly always discover that they fall into these two groups. The first group has been deceived into believing, as we have just noted, that you find the right by averaging right and wrong. If this were true, there would never be any use for intelligence and moral conviction.

The second group is usually fearful of taking a position which an enemy might characterize as "extreme" in spite of the fact that many ideas are attacked as extreme for no other reason than that they express clear-cut principles. Nearly all advocates of principles have been attacked at one time or another as "extremists." But if the principles were sound, the leaders generally prevailed. It does take some intestinal fortitude to champion an idea that has powerful enemies. But people who are frightened by this kind of criticism are usually afraid to stand up for any principle.

There is a third group of middle-of-the-roads which is even less admirable than these two. These are the opportunists, the believers in pure expediency, who think that the best chance is to take a middle position and play off both sides against each other. Then while the parties on either side are fighting they try to run off with the bacon. These are the ones who believe that you cannot really stand for something and win an election. They are generally afraid of all ideas because their sole object is to get into office. They are politicians in the worst sense of the word. Everybody recognizes this type of political "leader."

History, however, shows that they are dead wrong even about the matter of winning. Occasionally dodging about in the middle of the road does lead to a temporary victory. But these are fleeting successes for the simple reason that you can't fool all of the people all the time. In their hearts people despise a trimmer and, as soon as they find him out, they leave him. The great causes which have triumphed and the leaders which have led them have never been found in the middle of the road. They have set their course by some ideal and have resisted all temptations, which have some-

times been many, to come halfway to the other side. And the parties which have played the game of compromise on vital issues have seen their glory and their power vanish. For proof of this, let's go to history.

A century ago this country had an important and powerful party called the Whigs. Its leader was the attractive Henry Clay and he had support from the best elements in all parts of the country. But his party made the fatal mistake of trying to straddle the fence on major issues. As a result, it was not Clay, "the Great Compromiser," who went to the White House, but the hard-hitting Andrew Jackson. By 1856 the Whig Party was dead. Stephen A. Douglas tried the same trick, looking for the middle of the road between issues that were in direct conflict. He lost to Abraham Lincoln, who had taken a definite stand on one side. Even when the Democratic Party has won, on issues that many do not approve of, it has done so in taking a decisive stand for something. Better an opponent whose position you are certain of than a supposed friend whose only interest is in dodging the crucial issues. Such has generally been the judgment of the American voters on those who were merely looking for the line of least resistance.

We find that the story has been the same if we look at British politics. Two generations ago there was a powerful party in England called the Liberal Party. It was able to win elections at times and name the Prime Minister. Today it is little more than a ghost, a negligible element in British political life. The explanation of its demise is the same as that of the American Whigs. It tried to be a middle-of-the-road party, a party of compromise. But as always, the more pressing issues became, the more impatient people became with temporizing

and half solutions. The result was that the Liberal Party was squeezed to death between the Conservative Party and the rising Labor Party. These represent with considerable distinctness a right and a left. That is to say, they offer the people reasonably clear alternatives. The poor Liberal Party, interested solely in being tepid on all matters, has virtually ceased to exist.

SO MUCH FOR the claim that the middle of the road is the path to success. Dodging issues and watering down solutions is not merely the way to failure; it is the way to extinction.

All great political parties owe their vitality to the importance of the things they stand for. And this is never truer than in periods of defeat which, in the normal alteration of political circumstances, must sometimes occur. A beaten party with a real issue has an excellent chance of coming back. A beaten party without an issue is a dead duck. And those parties which have tied their fortunes to some personality who happens to excite the masses are only setting a term to their effectiveness. When he goes, as he must, the wind is out of their sails. A party which has abandoned issues for personalities cannot overnight make itself a party of principles again.

These considerations have a melancholy bearing upon the situation in our country today. There is one group, not clearly distinguished by a party name, but quite definite about what it wants and expects to bring about in this nation. Most accurately speaking, it is the party of collectivism. It works on various fronts and under various labels, but there need be no confusion about its objectives. It wants an America, new-modelled according to the Soviet Union.

There are two ideas in the philosophy of collectivism of which every American ought to be aware. One of them is a thorough-going materialism, which insists that man is merely a natural animal, which repudiates religion and all belief in the Divine Providence, and which maintains that happiness is purely a matter of gratifying this animal's appetites. The other idea is that the state is supreme and the individual nothing, that society should be managed down to the smallest details by a centralized authority, and that there is no higher power — no human tradition, no conscience, no precept of religion — by which this control can be criticized. An all-powerful state, designed along engineering lines to satisfy the physical wants of the masses, is their aim and goal, although often it is their method to admit only part of it at a time. In the writings of their prophets, Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, however, it is revealed without any squeamishness.

You would think that in this country of ours, with its heritage and its achievements, there would be a tremendous outcry and opposition to anything so one-sided in its interpretation of history and man's nature and so chilling to human instincts.

There is a great segment of our population to the right of collectivism and morally committed to fight it. Strange as it may sound, however, a good many of its leaders have adopted the policy of appeasement. Instead of issuing a direct challenge, in terms of principle, they have tried to see how many concessions they could make without being accused of surrender. They have tried to see how closely they could approach the position of collectivism while still paying lip service to what they are supposed to be defending.

Logic and duty call for them to stand up for their side, not to fight the battle by retreating from it. They have sought a middle-of-the-road position between a militant collectivism and our tradition of freedom and individualism. Historical examples show that the next step is capitulation, or liquidation of the party which is so cowardly.

IF THIS should come about, it will certainly be recorded by history that no people ever gave up so much for so little. We possess a great, beautiful, inspiring country. In our comparatively brief history we have created some traditions that any people would be proud to sustain; we have borne leaders and heroes to match those out of Plutarch; we have accomplished many things which by previous standards were thought impossible. We have combined equality with a method of rewarding success and distinction which has no parallel in history in its ability to produce social satisfaction and incentive to achievement.

Best of all, we have created a spirit of kindness and helpfulness which mitigates the lot of life's failures without trying absurdly to place them in the driver's seat. Every candid foreign observer is struck by this, and we feel intuitively that it is a very American thing. "Nowhere is cruelty more abhorred," Lord Bryce wrote admiringly of the America he saw. Now it is proposed to exchange this for the regimentation, the directives, the penalties, perhaps even the forced labor camps and executions of an alien and inhuman philosophy.

There is little doubt that the middle of the road today leads in this direction. The radicals know what they want; too many of the rest of us only temporize and hope.

Already a good many people are behaving as if their conscience hurt them over being American, so they give a little here and a little there in the hope of not being too offensive to the truculent enemy.

This is the reason that even the election of 1952 did not halt creeping socialism. Because no influential leader drew the line in terms of clear principle, the immense bureaucracy of the New Deal was allowed to consolidate itself further. This and that clamorous group has been able to extort state aid according to New Deal methods. All candid observers realize that the trend toward statism has not yet been reversed.

The need of the time is for a leadership willing to face the facts. Complacency toward what is happening is a betrayal of the America we have inherited. The kind of leader that people are willing to stay with, and to sacrifice personally for, is the kind that says, "I'm going to fight it out on this line if it takes all summer." Wavering and self-defeat through compromise where vital points are at stake never yet held a following. To win this struggle we have got to get on the right side of the road and keep it with resolution.

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies \$1; 25 copies \$2; 100 copies \$5; 500 copies \$20; 1,000 copies \$30. In 5,000 lots \$20 per thousand.

Richard M. Weaver is the author of the well-known book, *Ideas Have Consequences*. He is Professor of English at the University of Chicago and a member of the board of directors of the Foundation For American Principles and Traditions.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hangan. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. \$10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS for new subscribers only:
6 weeks for \$1.